

Remarks

This amendment is filed with a Request for Continued Examination pursuant to 37 C.F.R §1.114.

Claim 20 has been cancelled and claims 32-34, 36-39, and 41 have been amended. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification, including paragraphs [0023] (including discussion of browsing to a web page using a URL and/or link) paragraph [0031], and paragraph [0039] (including discussion of using cross-protocol mapping), along with paragraphs [0039.1] and [0039.2] (including material from application incorporated by reference).

I. Interview Summary

Although no agreement was reached, Assignee thanks Examiner Ludwig for the telephone interviews of March 8 and March 17, 2010, during which we discussed the rejections based on the CuteFTP Pro reference, the XMLSpy reference, and proposed claim language that has subsequently been used as the basis for the present amendment.

II. 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections¹

Claims 32-41 were rejected as anticipated by the “CuteFTP Pro Technical Overview” white paper (“CuteFTP Pro” herein).

¹ Claim 20 was rejected under §103, but as claim 20 has been cancelled, Assignee respectfully believes that rejection is moot.

As noted at paragraphs [0012], [0035]-[0039], some embodiments can allow a user to “surf” to a web page to be edited, enter an editing mode, and publish the page as-edited without foreknowledge of the file transfer system, providing for a seamless experience to the user.

A. CuteFTP Pro has not been shown to teach a “web browsing interface” or workflow as presently claimed.

Claims 32 and 37 recite “present[ing] a web browsing interface in a page editing application” and “receiv[ing] input in the web browsing interface, the input identifying a web page, **the input comprising entry of a URL of the identified web page or selection of a link to the identified web page.**” The claims also indicate that the edit command is received while the identified web page is displayed in the web browsing interface.

CuteFTP Pro refers at page 2 to “browsing” HTTPS sites, but Assignee does not believe that this use of the word “browsing” teaches accessing and displaying a web page in a web browser. Rather, CuteFTP Pro is a FTP application—page 11 shows a dynamic code editor and supports the view that CuteFTP Pro does not include a “web browsing interface.” Instead, files appear to be accessed through the file pane, not by way of a URL or link to a page of interest. The CuteFTP Pro

User's Guide (made of record with the March 21, 2006 Office Action) is consistent with this view.²

The CuteFTP Pro Overview mentions a “dynamic view in browser function” at page 11 , but the “CuteFTP Pro User's Guide” clarifies at page 103 that the browser is separate: “When previewing HTML documents created or edited in CuteFTP Pro's built-in editor you will see the documents in your computer's default browser, unless you specify a different browser.” Additionally, at page 94, the CuteFTP Pro User's Guide states that when an HTML document is printed from within CuteFTP Pro, “[t]he document will print as it appears in CuteFTP Pro, NOT as it would appear in a browser” (emphasis in original).

In view of the foregoing, Assignee respectfully asserts that CuteFTP Pro does not teach reaching the file to be edited via a web browsing interface as claimed.

B. CuteFTP Pro Does not Teach a “Cross-Protocol Mapping” as Claimed

The claims also recite “receiving input selecting a publish command in the page editing interface, and, in response, publishing the identified web page as edited by **using a cross-protocol mapping** to upload the identified web page as

² See page 94 (“To edit HTML documents on a remote site . . . connect to a remote server...Highlight an HTML document in the Remote pane...On the menu bar, click File > EditCuteFTP Pro downloads the document and opens it in the built-in HTML editor . . . Make your changes to the document...On the menu bar, click File > Save. CuteFTP Pro uploads the saved document to the remote server”).

edited to a file transfer protocol server, **the cross-protocol mapping created by the page editing application.**” This feature is not taught by CuteFTP Pro.

The Office Action states that CuteFTP Pro at page 9 teaches automatically updating a web page every few minutes. CuteFTP Pro does discuss folder synchronization at page 8 and using directory mirroring and a scheduler at page 9. However, use of the scheduler/folder synchronization features would necessitate some familiarity with the file transfer protocol server directory structure, in contrast to the presently-claimed embodiments.

For instance, as noted above, CuteFTP Pro provides for access of files using a file-oriented interface. Saving is accomplished using the same file name or by specifying a location via the same type of interface.³ Thus, any “publishing” in CuteFTP Pro is in response to user input, not using a cross-protocol mapping created by the page editing application.

For at least the reasons noted above, Assignee respectfully asserts that CuteFTP Pro has not been shown to teach all elements of the presently-claimed subject matter as arranged in the claims. Thus, the §102 rejections should be withdrawn.

³ See CuteFTP Pro User’s Guide at 93.

Conclusion

No additional fees are believed due at this time. If any additional fees are believed due for this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees and credit any refund to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

If there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned directly at 404.745.2447

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 29, 2010

/Eric G Zaiser/

Eric G. Zaiser
Reg. No. 58,352

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree St. NE
Atlanta, GA 30309
404.745.2447 (voice)
404.541.3290 (fax)